

# FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, July 10, 2003

---

## PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION/EAST CONFERENCE ROOM

***Present:*** Chairman Kent Forsgren, Commission Members Bart Hill, Jim Talbot, Jordan White, Sid Young, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman  
Commission Members Cindy Roybal and Cory Ritz were excused.

**Chairman Forsgren** began discussion of the following items at 6:35 P.M.:

- Agenda Item #4—request for final plat approval for Oakwood Estates Phase III at 550 West 1900 North. The applicant wanted to add one more lot to the subdivision. The Fire Chief and Public Works director reviewed the request and found it to be acceptable at this time. A neighbor called the City Offices recently and expressed concern about drainage related to Phase II and wanted the developer to install a flood mitigating berm to protect his property. During the Planning Commission review for Phase II, the developer had consented to building the berm.
- Agenda Item #5—request for final plat approval for the proposed Tuscany Cove at Lake Pointe Subdivision located at 1700 South 300 East. Mr. Petersen reviewed the conditions which needed to be considered before approval. One major issue was the potential for low water pressure for several lots. The developer's engineer and the City's engineer had differing opinions. Most residences in Farmington City enjoy culinary water pressure equal to or greater than 60 psi.
- Agenda Item #6—Leisure Villas developers request for a recommendation to the City Council for annexation, an amendment to the General Plan, and the rezoning of property northwest of Oakridge Farms from A to R-2. Mr. Petersen reported there were a considerable number of notifications sent to property owners in the area. Several issues needed to be addressed, among which was a potential for negative traffic impact on Shepard Lane.
- Agenda Item #7—The City was requesting consideration of rezoning large portions of the central area of Farmington to "Original Townsite Residential" (OTR) and to amend the General Plan to conform to the change. Because of a mailing error in the last public hearing regarding this issue, Mr. Petersen suggested the meeting be opened to a public hearing to allow comment from property owners who may have been missed.

- Agenda Item #8–B&D Real Estate development proposal in south Farmington. Bruce Dickamore asked to be placed on the agenda to receive input from the Commission Members regarding a proposed subdivision on Lund Lane west of 200 East. The item was for discussion only.

### **PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION**

***Present:*** Chairman Kent Forsgren, Commission Members Bart Hill, Cory Ritz, Jim Talbot, Jordan White, Sid Young, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman. Commission Member Cindy Roybal was excused.

**Chairman Forsgren** called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. He offered the invocation.

### **FARMINGTON TRAILS BOOKLET PRESENTATION/GEORGE CHIPMAN (Agenda Item #1)**

**Mr. Chipman** presented Farmington Trails Booklets to each member of the Planning Commission in appreciation for their support of the Farmington trails projects.

**Chairman Forsgren** expressed gratitude on behalf of the Commission, not only for the receipt of the booklets, but for the time and effort donated by the Farmington Trails Committee.

### **UTA COMMUTER RAIL PRESENTATION (Agenda #2)**

**Steven Meyers** (representing UTA) was present to give Commission Members information regarding proposed UTA commuter rail systems through Davis County. He covered the following points:

- The project includes a 30-year, long-range plan to connect Payson and Brigham City along the Wasatch front with a commuter rail system.
- The project began with a feasibility study started in 1996.
- In 2002, approximately 175 miles of rail corridor was purchased for the project from Union Pacific railroad.
- Commuter rail has several advantages over traditional road traffic. Commuter rail traffic is not mixed with other traffic uses so there are fewer delays.
- Mr. Meyers reviewed the amenities that would be a part of the commuter system.

There could be double deck cars for more seating. All transports would be ADA accessible.

- ▮ The goal was to have the system cost efficient. Encouraging ridership would be of paramount importance. Federal funds were being sought.
- ▮ Currently, there are 9 proposed stations between north Weber County and Salt Lake City, including one at Farmington.
- ▮ Mr. Meyers also covered how station sites had been selected.
- ▮ A timeline was discussed.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Agenda Item #3)**

**Sid Young** moved that the minutes of the June 26, 2003, Planning Commission Meeting be approved with corrections as noted. **Jim Talbot** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor. Commission Members Bart Hill, Cory Ritz, and Jordan White abstained due to their absence during the 26<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **PUBLIC HEARING: SHEPARD RIDGE ENTERPRISES LC, REQUEST FOR FINAL PLAT APPROVAL TO DEVELOP THE SECOND PLAT OF OAKWOOD ESTATES PHASE II CONSISTING OF ONE LOT ON .54 ACRES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 550 WEST 1900 NORTH IN AN LR-F ZONE (S-5-03) (Agenda Item #4)**

#### **Background Information**

The developer, who presently lives in an adjacent neighborhood south of the subdivision, has received a request from a nearby property owner and resident to develop another lot adjacent to Lot 207. This lot is illustrated as Lot "415" on the attached vicinity map and other enclosed drawings. If approved and platted, the new lot will be known as Lot 301.

The approved preliminary plat shows a conservation easement along the west portion of the subject lot. The open space for the entire eventual subdivision is primarily located in Parcel B. There is a temporary open space easement recorded over all of Parcel A. This must remain until the open space in Parcel B is provided in a manner acceptable to the City. The conservation easement proposed for the subject lot should not nullify this previous open space arrangement agreed to by both parties via a development agreement.

Both the Public Works and Fire Departments have reviewed the Developer's plan for the subject Lot. Most of their concerns will be met if the condition related to the temporary turn-around issue is met.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** reviewed the background information.

### **Public Hearing**

**Chairman Forsgren** opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

**Robert Dale** noted that Lonnie Bullard was already constructing his home on one of the lots. They were willing to comply with all City requirements.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

With no further comments, **Chairman Forsgren** closed the public hearing. The Commission members discussed the issues, including the following points:

- The road is longer than the 1000 foot dead end street limitation. However, North Compton Road is one of the roads identified in the City ordinance as a legally, non-conforming dead end street in the City. It is treated differently than others. The design of the subdivision calls for a loop road.
- There was concern regarding drainage and a promised berm for flood mitigation. The developer stated the berm had not been a part of the conditions for approval because the drainage problem existed prior to the development. However, they were willing to install a rock-lined ditch for water flow and had committed to adjacent property owners that it would be done. Mr. Dale stated the ditch would also be a benefit to the developer.

### **Motion**

**Cory Ritz** moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council grant final plat approval for the second plat of the Oakwood Estates Phase II Subdivision subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances and the following conditions:

1. The temporary turn-around identified on the first plat adjacent to Lot 207 shall be relocated next to the subject lot. The existing temporary turn-around shall not be abandoned by the City until the new temporary turn-around is completed all together acceptable to the Fire Department and Public Works Department.
2. The applicant shall comply with all conditions of preliminary plat approval, including, but not limited to the following:
  - a. The applicant must obtain a flood control permit from Davis County and provide a copy of the permit to the City.
  - b. Final improvement drawings, including a grading and drainage plan (and a revegetation plan) shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, Planning Department, Central Davis County Sewer District and FAPID. The Developer must be sensitive to NPDES requirements mandated by the EPA, meet minimum slope requirements of 12 percent for the streets and follow minimum cut and fill standards required by ordinance.
  - c. Prepare a maintenance plan for the associated conservation land for review and approval by the City.
  - d. The applicant shall implement flooding and erosion control measures acceptable to the City especially for the temporary turn-around area.
3. The developer shall comply with all terms of Development Agreement A-2002-28 for the Oakwood Estates Phase II subdivision.
4. The conservation area illustrated on the Lot shall be clearly identified as a "Conservation Easement" on the plat. The developer shall submit for review and approval by the City a conservation easement for this area. This easement shall be recorded concurrently with the final plat. The open space easement over Parcel "A" of the previously recorded final plat shall still remain in full force and effect.
5. The subject lot shall have a front and rear yard public utility easement of 10 feet and at least one side yard easement which shall be the same dimension as the minimum side yard required by the Zoning Ordinance.
6. A note shall be placed on the final plat indicating that a soil report has been prepared and submitted to the City for the proposed subdivision in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance.

7. The developer shall construct a flood control berm in the southwest corner in the manner previously committed and prior to construction on Lot 301.

In discussion of the motion, Commission Members inquired whether or not the berm issue could become a condition at this point. They were concerned about the timing of the construction due to weather and other conditions. The property owner who raised the issue had been notified of the meeting but was not in attendance. Several options were discussed.

**Mr. Ritz** withdrew his motion.

### **Motion**

**Jim Talbot** moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council grant final plat approval for the second plat of the Oakwood Estates Phase II Subdivision subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances and the following conditions:

1. The temporary turn-around identified on the first plat adjacent to Lot 207 shall be relocated next to the subject lot. The existing temporary turn-around shall not be abandoned by the City until the new temporary turn-around is completed all together acceptable to the Fire Department and Public Works Department.
2. The applicant shall comply with all conditions of preliminary plat approval, including, but not limited to the following:
  - a. The applicant must obtain a flood control permit from Davis county and provide a copy of the permit to the City.
  - b. Final improvement drawings, including a grading and drainage plan (and a revegetation plan) shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, Planning Department, Central Davis County Sewer District and FAPID. The Developer must be sensitive to NPDES requirements mandated by the EPA, meet minimum slope requirements of 12 percent for the streets and follow minimum cut and fill standards required by ordinance.
  - c. Prepare a maintenance plan for the associated conservation land for review and approval by the City.
  - d. The applicant shall implement flooding and erosion control measures acceptable to the City especially for the temporary turn-around area.
3. The developer shall comply with all terms of Development Agreement A-2002-28

for the Oakwood Estates Phase II subdivision.

4. The conservation area illustrated on the Lot shall be clearly identified as a "Conservation Easement" on the plat. The developer shall submit for review and approval by the City a conservation easement for this area. This easement shall be recorded concurrently with the final plat. The open space easement over Parcel "A" of the previously recorded final plat shall still remain in full force and effect.

5. The subject lot shall have a front and rear yard public utility easement of 10 feet and at least one side yard easement which shall be the same dimension as the minimum side yard required by the Zoning Ordinance.

6. A note shall be placed on the final plat indicating that a soil report has been prepared and submitted to the City for the proposed subdivision in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance.

**Jordan White** seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, Mr. Talbot stated he felt the berm should be constructed but he felt the developers would keep their commitment to do so. He felt it would not be fair to tie approval to an off-site condition. Several Commission Members discussed options regarding follow up on the issue.

**Jim Talbot** withdrew his motion.

**Jordan White** moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council grant final plat approval for the second plat of the Oakwood Estates Phase II Subdivision subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances and the following conditions:

1. The temporary turn-around identified on the first plat adjacent to Lot 207 shall be relocated next to the subject lot. The existing temporary turn-around location shall not be abandoned by the City until the new temporary turn-around is completed all together acceptable to the Fire Department and Public Works Department.
2. The applicant shall comply with all conditions of preliminary plat approval, including, but not limited to the following:
  - a. The applicant must obtain a flood control permit from Davis county and provide a copy of the permit to the City.

- b. Final improvement drawings, including a grading and drainage plan (and a revegetation plan) shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, Planning Department, Central Davis County Sewer District and FAPID. The Developer must be sensitive to NPDES requirements mandated by the EPA, meet minimum slope requirements of 12 percent for the streets and follow minimum cut and fill standards required by ordinance.
  - c. Prepare a maintenance plan for the associated conservation land for review and approval by the City.
  - d. The applicant shall implement flooding and erosion control measures acceptable to the City especially for the temporary turn-around area.
3. The developer shall comply with all terms of Development Agreement A-2002-28 for the Oakwood Estates Phase II
4. The conservation area illustrated on the Lot shall be clearly identified as a "Conservation Easement" on the plat. The developer shall submit for review and approval by the City a conservation easement for this area. This easement shall be recorded concurrently with the final plat. The open space easement over Parcel "A" of the previously recorded final plat shall still remain in full force and effect.
5. The subject lot shall have a front and rear yard public utility easement of 10 feet and at least one side yard easement which shall be the same dimension as the minimum side yard required by the Zoning Ordinance.
6. A note shall be placed on the final plat indicating that a soil report has been prepared and submitted to the City for the proposed subdivision in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance.
7. The Planning Commission recommends that the developer should construct a flood control berm in the southwest corner of the first plat of the second phase of the Oakwood Estates Subdivision.

**Bart Hill** seconded the motion. The vote was 4 to 1 in favor of the motion. Mr. Talbot opposed the motion.

### **Findings**



1. The application met City standards and ordinances, including a previous agreement with the developer, and complied with the General Plan.
2. The developer was working towards cooperation with the requirements set forth by the Planning Commission.

**HAWKINS COMPANIES REQUEST FOR FINAL PLAT APPROVAL FOR THE PROPOSED TUSCANY COVE AT LAKE POINTE SUBDIVISION LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1700 SOUTH LUND AND 300 EAST (Agenda Item #5)**

**Background Information**

This application was reviewed by the Planning Commission on June 12, 2003, and thereafter tabled in order to allow time to resolve issues outlined in the letter addressed to Bar Longson of Hawkins Companies, dated June 18, 2003. The City Engineer's water test results are different from the developers' engineer. If the Planning Commission would like to place a note on the plat regarding these water pressures, our City Attorney has suggested some language that may be acceptable.

Enclosed for the Planning Commission's information is a draft off-site public utilities easement for the culinary water line, a letter of understanding regarding the off-site trail easement, and a consent to dedicate form for the storm drainage easement. Except for one or two word changes, the public utility easements and conditions 1 through 5 on the letter dated July 3, 2003, regarding the trail easement are basically acceptable. The issue regarding the drainage consent to dedicate form are still being worked through at this time and may be resolved by Thursday's meeting.

Regarding the third issue identified on the June 18<sup>th</sup> letter, the City attorney, suggested that the access road over and across Open Space Parcel A should not be identified as a public or a private access road but should just simply be an "access road."

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**David Petersen** reviewed previous requirements from the Planning Commission regarding final plat approval. He stated that the developer's engineer and the City's engineer had differed regarding the pounds per square inch (psi) measurements for some lots in the subdivision. The City engineer indicated the developer's engineer had not taken into consideration the terrain over which the water pipe had to travel. The terrain would reduce the pressure of the water flow because of the gullies through which it would have to pass. It may be

possible to include a pump system for some of the homes in order to increase the pressure when needed. Mr. Petersen also stated there was an issue regarding 3 off-site easements which needed to be obtained. The easements involved multiple land owners. The developer would have to obtain acceptable forms before approval could be given. The access road located in open space "A" was also an issue. The City's attorney had reviewed the issue and gave the opinion that the road should be designated "access" with no other identifying titles such as *public* or *private*. Mr. Petersen also reviewed a letter from William R. Lang, representing the Schilly Group dated July 3, 2003. Mr. Petersen stated the City was in agreement with tenants of the letter except for the last paragraph which called for the City to provide adequate funds to effectively and adequately post, monitor, maintain, and police trails near the property. The City is not currently in a position to fund or acquire liability for what was being asked.

The Planning Commission discussed the agenda item, including the following points:

- Negotiations between Farmington and Centerville called for property exchange. Public Hearing for the boundary line adjustment had been set for early in August.
- Forms acceptable to the City regarding the three off-site easements were near completion.
- The easements must be in place prior to recordation.
- The water pressure was a concern. Most homes in Farmington experience 60 psi. There were some lots in the subdivision that may not reach that mark. It was a concern of the Planning Commission that potential buyers be made aware of the potential problem. Several options to accomplish that were discussed.
- The Planning Commission felt the City should make 60 psi the City's standard by ordinance.
- The developer stated he would do the best he could to rectify the situation and raise the psi as high as possible for all the lots in the subdivision. He recommended there be a letter of consent tied to the building permit to help inform the public of the potential problem.

### **Motion**

**Sid Young** moved that the Planning Commission grant final plat approval for the Tuscany Cove at Lake Point Subdivision subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinance and the following conditions:

1. The developer shall meet all applicable requirements of preliminary plat approval, including but not limited to, conditions 1 through 4 which are specifically related to the dirt road over and across Open Space Parcel A. Furthermore, the language describing said road on the final plat must meet the review and approval by the City Attorney.
2. Final approval of improvement drawings including a grading and drainage plan by the City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, FAPID, Central Davis County Sewer District and/or South Davis County Sewer District, and UDOT. The developer shall provide a site specific drainage plan for each lot within the subdivision including a proposed finished floor elevation and approximate grade of the driveway.
3. In consideration of unmet on-site open space requirements related to the total number of lots received by the developer as a conservation subdivision, the developer should obtain off-site trail easements from the owners of property just east of the Tuscany Cove development. The off-site trail easement should, in general, go over and across the existing dirt road and trail leading from the proposed Centerville/Farmington trailhead site in a northeasterly direction to the boundary of said property. Another trail easement accessible to the City should be established along the Weber Basin aqueduct road from the northern boundary line of said property to the Centerville City boundary. The off-site trail easement should be recorded concurrently with the recordation of the final plat. Prior to this recordation, the developer shall stake the center line of the trail for inspection by City staff.
4. Off-site culinary water easements, acceptable to the City, to the new reservoir shall be obtained by the developer. Moreover, the developer shall construct and extend from the subdivision to the reservoir a 10" water line to provide adequate fire flow capacity and water service to the Tuscany Cove project. The off-site culinary water easement shall be recorded concurrently with the recordation of the final plat. Prior to this recordation the developer shall stake the center line of the easement for inspection by City staff.
5. The applicant shall obtain off-site storm water easements or "Consent to Receive Storm Waters" forms acceptable to the City running from 200 East to the general vicinity of the Lagoon billboard near 1470 South and the frontage road. The off-site storm water easement shall be recorded concurrently with the recordation of the final plat. Prior to this recordation the developer shall stake the center line of the off-site storm water easement for inspection by City staff if an easement is obtained instead of a consent form.

6. A note shall be placed on the final plat indicating the soils report has been prepared and submitted to the City for the proposed subdivision in accordance with the provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance.
7. The developer shall comply with all provisions of the boundary exchange contemplated in Resolution 2003-19 regardless if the final plat is recorded prior to or after said boundary line adjustment.
8. The developer shall enter into a Development Agreement with the City regarding the project prior to or concurrent with final plat approval.
9. Concurrently with the recordation of the final plat, the developer shall establish a conservation easement, acceptable to the City, over the open space and 30 % slope areas identified on the plat.
10. The developer shall submit for review by the City with the final plat: the name; proposed articles of incorporation; and any by-laws of the owner or organization empowered to own, maintain, or pay taxes on open space land within the plat.
11. Regarding culinary water service to Lots 2 and 3 and 20 through 23, a note shall be placed on the final plat which reads in part:

“Culinary water pressure for Lots 2 and 3 and 20 through 24 has tested less than 60 psi which may limit concurrent use of multiple plumbing fixtures. An additional individual culinary water pump system may be advisable for each house on said lots..”
12. The Planning Commission recommends that language for an acknowledgment form be reviewed by the City Attorney whereby individual lot owners accept culinary water pressures less than 60 psi, and upon the City Attorney’s recommendation, said acknowledgment form should be included with the building permit applications for Lots 2 and 3 and 20 through 24.

**Jordan White** seconded the motion.

The Planning Commission discussed the motion. Mr. Petersen stated with the current work load of the Planning Department, it may be difficult for personnel to guarantee the acknowledgment forms will be checked with every building permit required for the specific lots. If City personnel is neglectful on even one permit, the City could be held liable. Commission Members discussed their desire to inform the public of the potential problem and considered

options for doing so. In any case, it would not be the responsibility of the City's Planning Department to ensure adequate pressure for the water lines.

A roll call vote evidenced the motion carried by a 3 to 2 vote. Mr. Talbot and Mr. Ritz opposed the motion.

### **Findings**

- ↯ The application met City standards and ordinances, and complied with the General Plan.
- ↯ Conditions set were pursuant to Planning Commission requests.
- ↯ The motion provided for road, trail, and drainage easement to be accomplished.
- ↯ The Planning Commission had done everything they have been empowered to do to protect the public.
- ↯ The water pressure psi meets minimum Utah State code.
- ↯ The Planning Commission Chairman encouraged the developer do to everything possible to please property purchasers regarding the water pressure for the lots indicated.

**PUBLIC HEARING: DAVE ERICKSON (LEISURE VILLAS) REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO : 1) ANNEX 11.8641 ACRES NORTHWEST OF THE OAKRIDGE FARM SUBDIVISION, 2) AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN BY REDESIGNATING THE AREA AND ADJACENT PROPERTY FROM "LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL" TO "MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL," AND 3) ZONE THE AREA TO R-2 AND REZONE 9.49 ACRES WEST OF SAID SUBDIVISION FROM LR TO R-2 (A-1-03) (Agenda Item#6)**

### **Background Information**

The Developer's motive for the annexation is to develop a private senior community PUD (Planned Unit Development) consisting of 80 lots on 14.3 acres. The subject location is not consistent with the recommendations of the General Plan. The General Plan states that, "While low density, single-family residences are most preferred in Farmington, a few areas may be appropriate for some limited higher density developments." The proposed PUD location next to

I-15 could be one of these areas. Nevertheless, recommendation 10 contained in the General Plan limits the “medium density” to specific areas, and the location proposed by the applicant is not one of these areas.

The development proposal does provide an alternative form of housing and the open space and walking path seem consistent with the City Trail Master Plan, but what are the traffic ramifications of such a proposal. Several months ago, Farmington City exerted great effort to convince UDOT to construct a necessary south bound off-ramp from U.S. 89 to Burke Lane. As part of this effort, the City assured UDOT that the traffic volumes on Shepard Lane would not negatively impact the new off-ramp. The City agreed to pursue a “Western Frontage Road” from Shepard Lane west of I-15 to the new interchange north of the Justice Complex to help alleviate future traffic congestion problems which may occur on Shepard Lane east of I-15. How does the proposal by the applicant fit into the City’s transportation plans for the area?

Furthermore, although the proposed development is adjacent to I-15, direct access to the site is achieved by local streets; and all the surrounding neighborhoods are single-family residential. Through economic development and TDR planning efforts of the last few months it appears that areas along the U.S. 89 corridor will be set aside for multiple family development. If these plans come to pass, how will additional multiple-family elsewhere in the City impact the goal whereby single-family residences are most preferred in Farmington? On the other hand, as has been reported to the Planning Commission numerous times, more roof-tops may help Farmington’s commercial tax base.

Single-family neighborhoods adjacent to freeways are sometimes not an ideal land use due to the tremendous noise often associated with freeways. Multiple-family neighborhoods maybe a more appropriate use next to freeways.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** reviewed the background information and described the property under consideration. The property is within the annexation area of Farmington. He stated the applicant was asking for annexation and a zone designation of R-2 upon annexation. Mr. Petersen reviewed potential traffic impact on Shepard Lane if the multiple family dwellings were constructed. Since the project would be within the Shepard Lane traffic impact area, should they be included in a financial agreement being considered to help build frontage roads in the area. Mr. Petersen stated a traffic study would be needed. He also posed the question regarding how the development would fit with the over-all goals of the City.

### **Public Hearing**

**Chairman Forsgren** opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to

**Dave Erickson** (Vice President of Leisure Villas) stated that the goal of the project was to provide a private senior community in Farmington. His company had built several similar type projects, which had met with great success. He reviewed the need for such senior facilities and stated that Davis County would need senior housing within 20 years, when senior population would double. Many Davis County residents would like to remain in the area. The Leisure Villas would provide the means whereby older citizens could remain in Davis County. The community needs to plan for such needs. Mr. Erickson said the project would fit best on the property proposed because it would provide an ideal buffer between the freeway and other uses. He discussed planned amenities such as the nature park and trail system. The community would be restricted to seniors in perpetuity. He felt the traffic impact on the area would be significantly less than it would be with single-family dwellings. There would be a total of 80 homes with 1.6 people per unit. The number would go down with time. There would only be 1.4 cars per unit, which is less than the number for single family homes.

**Paul Hayward** (1663 West 1410 North) was opposed to the project because he felt the density was too high and the landscape design was too barren. He felt the traffic impact on the neighborhood would be negative. Senior living facilities have a lot of visitors, especially on Sundays and holidays. Mr. Hayward was also concerned that the senior housing project would lower the property value of surrounding neighbors. He cited Kaysville as an example of how high density projects are not desirable and how they lower the value of surrounding property.

**David Hale** (1664 West 1410 North) stated the General Plan should not be changed to accommodate a single developer. There was a need for senior housing in Farmington, but it needs to be in the right location. He felt the proposed site for the Leisure Villas was not good for the City. He was also concerned for property value. There were several estate lots in the neighborhood which would not mix well with the high density, multi-family dwellings. The traffic was a big concern. Building the multi-family dwellings in the area would add to the already burdened Shepard Lane traffic. Mr. Hale was in favor of annexing the property but cautioned that the use should be carefully considered.

**George Clark** (1717 North 1500 West) said he was in support of the annexation but wanted to have the property developed into single family dwellings on half acre lots.

**Gordon Lyon** (1502 North Frontage Road) had bought his property when it was in the County in 1978. At that time it was agricultural zoning. He was on the border of Kaysville and Farmington. He decided to annex to Farmington to help keep the multi-family homes out of the area. Utilities had been a problem, including low water pressure. He had thought about developing his property in the same kind of project as Jamestown. He had gone through several different options for development. In 1996 he received approval to develop but did not move

ahead with it. He had other partners who wanted high density developments. He would not be happy with the high density senior project next door.

**Rick Wyss** (1442 North 1670 West) stated his property would be the most impacted by the proposed project. He would have the multi-family homes on two sides of his property. He was opposed to the project because he felt it would devalue his property. The landscaping was very minimal and the density was too high. It looked to him like tiny homes in a parking lot. He objected to the encroachment on two sides of his home. He had been told at the time he purchased his home that the property would develop into 1/3 to 1/2 acre lots with single family homes.

**Jim Lyon** (702 South 350 East) felt that the traffic on the frontage road would be even worse if the project were allowed to move forward. He was also opposed to the high density of the proposed senior living multi-family homes.

**James Clark** (1771 North 1500 West) wanted to have the area developed into single-family dwellings and asked that the developer look for another area on which to locate the senior homes which would be more accommodating.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

With no further comments, **Chairman Forsgren** closed the public hearing. The Commission members discussed the issues, including the following points:

- There is a need for senior housing in Farmington. The concept of Leisure Villas project is satisfactory. Less yard work is often desirable for aging citizens.
- It may not be the right location for the high density project. In consideration of the current economic studies being conducted, it may be well to ascertain what is being proposed for the big picture in Farmington before deciding on this specific location for multi-family senior housing. Approving the project would require a rezone. Perhaps it would be good to look at areas already zoned for the use.
- Annexation of the property would be a good thing. The property will be left in an island surrounded by Farmington City if it is not annexed. The land is within the Farmington annexation area.
- The proposed project does not seem to fit with the surrounding uses. It is not within General Plan goals. The project is opposed by many of the neighbors.
- It would be well to conduct a traffic study of the area before approving more



construction. The area roads are already near maximum loads.

- ▮ Information gained from the developer regarding the need for senior housing was helpful.

### **Motion**

**Jordan White** moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council annex 11.8641 acres northwest of the Oakridge Farm Subdivision as requested. **Cory Ritz** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **Findings**

The property proposed for annexation is included in Farmington City's Expansion Plan which was adopted as part of the Farmington City Annexation Policy Plan on August 15, 2001.

### **Motion**

**Cory Ritz** moved that the Planning Commission table consideration to amend the General Plan by redesignating the area northwest of the Oakridge Farm Subdivision and adjacent property from "Low Density Residential" to "Medium Density Residential" to allow time for the Planning Commissioners to read the information enclosed in the packet; and until transportation plans conducted by the City, including ways to finance such things as the "Western Frontage Road,," are more complete or until the developer provides a traffic impact study; and until the City's long term multiple housing plans are better understood and/or until the City completes the long anticipated U.S. 89 land-use General Plan update. **Sid Young** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **Motion**

**Jim Talbot** moved that the Planning Commission table consideration of the request to zone 9.49 acres west of Oakridge Farm Subdivision from LR to R-2 until appropriate amendments to the General Plan are approved by the City. The rezone maybe considered concurrently with General Plan amendments. **Jordan White** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**PUBLIC HEARING: FARMINGTON CITY REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO REZONE LARGE PORTIONS OF THE CENTRAL AREA OF FARMINGTON TO "ORIGINAL TOWNSITE RESIDENTIAL" (OTR) AND TO AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN FOR PORTIONS OF THE AREA ACCORDINGLY. THE SUBJECT AREA FOR THE PROPSOED ZONE CHANGE IS GENERALLY**

**LOCATED BETWEEN 600 NORTH AND 200 SOUTH AND BETWEEN I-15 AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD AROUND THE MONTE VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (Z-4-03)**  
**(Agenda Item #7)**

**Background Information**

The Planning Commission held an extensive public hearing regarding this item on June 26, 2003. It was decided to leave portions of the neighborhood south and west of the Courthouse out of the OTR zone to allow time for further study. Property owners in this area have been invited to attend tonight's meeting in order to establish a steering committee to further look at this area in greater detail

At the June 16 meeting the Planning Commission tabled consideration of this agenda item so that the City Planner could redraw a map showing the areas proposed to be included as part of the rezone decision.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** reviewed the background information and stated the map had been redrawn and was included in the packet. He detailed areas now included in the application for rezone and discussed parcels that he felt should be either included or excluded in the application.

**Public Hearing**

**Chairman Forsgren** opened the meeting to a public hearing.

**Paul Hayward** (1663 West 1410 North) stated his understanding that the OTR was primarily for single family dwellings. He felt that the BR zone remaining in the downtown area was too small to help produce a tax base for the City, especially if the plans were still in place to bring in a small grocery store.

**Ralph Wilcox** (Bountiful, owner of property in the downtown area) asked that his property be excluded from the current rezone application. He then volunteered to be a member of the steering committee to discuss the new zoning ordinance for the area just west of the Courthouse.

**Public Hearing Closed**

With no further comments, **Chairman Forsgren** closed the public hearing. The Planning Commission discussed the agenda item, including the following points:

- ↯ Several Commissioners wondered why the Smith lot had been excluded when other properties may have wanted the same consideration. After discussion, it was decided to include the Smith lot in the area remaining under study.
- ↯ The old abandoned house near the Hokanson property on the east side of the original townsite had safety and health issues. It was decided not to include the property in the OTR consideration.
- ↯ The property adjacent to the Haugen Body Shop includes about 7 acres of undeveloped land. Approximately four historic homes exist on the property. It was decided to include those 4 homes in the OTR zone for consideration by the City Council.

### **Motion**

**Cory Ritz** moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that they rezone large portions of central area of Farmington “Original Townsite Residential” (OTR) and to amend the General Plan for portions of the area accordingly. The subject area for the proposed zone change is generally located between 600 North and 200 South and between I-15 and the neighborhood around the Monte Vista Elementary School, with inclusions and exclusions as discussed in the meeting. **Bart Hill** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **Findings**

- ↯ Citizens and property owners within the affected areas had a great deal of input into the proposed amendment to Chapter 17 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding the Original Townsite Residential Zone.
- ↯ The OTR reflects flexibility while preserving the historic nature of the original townsite area. The OTR also protects private property rights.
- ↯ The OTR complies with the City’s General Plan.

### **MOTION TO MEET PAST 10:00 P.M.**

**Sid Young** moved that the Planning Commission address agenda items past the hour of 10:00 P.M. **Jim Talbot** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**B&D REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL/SOUTH FARMINGTON (Agenda Item #8)**

The Planning Commission considered information presented by Bruce Dickamore of the B&D Real Estate Development regarding developing approximately 9 acres of land on the north side of Lund Lane west of 200 East. The Planning Commission considered the agenda item as discussion only.

**Bruce Dickamore** made the following points:

- Mr. Dickamore's company had developed land in several states. Each time he becomes involved with a new development, he approaches the planning commissions of the different communities for input before deciding on elements of new projects.
- The property under consideration has recently become available for development.
- Mr. Dickamore had already contacted Centerville City regarding shared utilities and other issues of concern to both municipalities.
- To be economically feasible, the lots will have to be between 10,000 and 12,000 square feet in size. The yield plan for the developer's desired zoning would allow more lots than have been proposed.
- The developer had two basic designs. One provided a looped street with lots on both sides of the road and lots along Lund Lane. The other design provided 3 cul-de-sacs, each with an entrance off Lund Lane. An option suggested was to have a privacy fence along Lund Lane with the back of lots towards the fence. The developer preferred the cul-de-sacs because the street scape would not include the back of lots, but just a few side yards.
- The developer proposed open space at the corner of Lund Lane and 200 East with landscaping to provide an attractive southeast entrance to the City.
- The developer stated he wanted to build a quality subdivision, including protective covenants to guarantee a quality project.

Planning Commission input included the following points:

- ↯ Traffic impact along Lund Lane would need to be considered. The current conditions of the road will not allow heavy use.
- ↯ The Public Works Department is not in favor of cul-de-sacs because of limited plowing and emergency vehicle access.
- ↯ As a matter of information, historically, south Farmington citizens have been opposed to most high density developments. The area is currently zoned only for large lot, single-family homes.
- ↯ The developer was encouraged to gather more information about creative ways to develop the property to include more open space, eliminate double-loaded streets, and include sensitivity to neighbors who enjoy a very rural atmosphere.
- ↯ Farmington has a strong sense of community and has a strong commitment to maintaining its unique historic and rural characteristics. It is important that the City maintain the feeling of “entering Farmington” at its City boundaries. This has been accomplished by the open space and rural nature of the land. A successful development at the entrance to the City would need to recognize those characteristics.
- ↯ It was recognized that the property in the southern part of the City will develop, but it is likely that City officials will maintain zoning that will protect larger lots and/or large open spaces.

#### **CITY COUNCIL REPORT AND MISCELLANEOUS**

- ↯ The City Council considered an amendment to the BR zone text to permit small auto dealerships. Staff will return to the City Council at a future meeting with a draft ordinance which will restrict dealerships to parcels ½ acre in size. The draft will include several restrictions in hopes of protecting BR zones especially in the downtown area from auto dealerships.
- ↯ The City has hired an economic development consultant. The consultant has already begun work.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**Cory Ritz** moved to adjourn at 10:45 P.M.

---

*Kent Forsgren, Chairman*  
*Farmington City Planning Commission*